

REMARKS

Response to the Restriction Requirement

In the Office Action mailed September 11, 2006, the Examiner imposed a genus/species type restriction requirement and required the Applicant to choose one of the following species for prosecution on the merits:

- 1 – Figures 2-3;
- 2 – Figure 4;
- 3 – Figure 5;
- 4 – Figure 6; and
- 5 – Figure 8.

In response to the foregoing, Applicant hereby elects the embodiment of Figures 2-3 for prosecution on the merits. This election is made without traverse.

Claims 11-21 read on the elected species.

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claim 1 was generic to all of the species. Applicant respectfully submits that this is not the case. Claim 1 specifies that the connector link includes a handgrip. In the embodiments shown in Figures 2-5, the handgrip (28', 48') is disposed upon a respective second link (28 or 48). In the Figures 6-8 drawings, the handgrip is in fact disposed upon the connector link. As such, claim 1 is not generic to the elected species. Applicant does note, however, that claim 21 is in fact generic to all of the illustrated species. Applicant further notes that claim 11, as well as various of the claims dependent thereupon, also reads upon the Figures 4 and 5 embodiments, since those embodiments do include a handgrip disposed upon the second link.

New Claim 26

New claim 26 is dependent upon claim 11. This claim finds full support in the specification as originally filed, for example at page 2 and in Figure 1. This claim specifies the nature of the arm motion achieved through the use of the present invention.

Dated: October 11, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Ronald W. Citkowski

Registration No.: 31,005

GIFFORD, KRASS, GROH, SPRINKLE,
ANDERSON & CITKOWSKI, P.C.

2701 Troy Center Drive, Suite 330

Post Office Box 7021

Troy, Michigan 48007-7021

(248) 647-6000

Attorney for Applicant

RWC/gs